

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 347 247

UD 028 750

AUTHOR Slavin, Robert E.
TITLE Staff Development and R & D in Chapter 1 Programs of the Future.
INSTITUTION Center for Research on Effective Schooling for Disadvantaged Students, Baltimore, MD.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
REPORT NO TAC-B-240
PUB DATE May 92
CONTRACT OERI-R-117-R90002
NOTE 9p.
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Compensatory Education; Disadvantaged Youth; Educational Finance; Educationally Disadvantaged; Educational Practices; Elementary Secondary Education; Evaluation Methods; *Federal Programs; Financial Support; Futures (of Society); *Instructional Improvement; Program Development; *Research and Development; Research Needs; *Resource Allocation; *Staff Development
IDENTIFIERS Hawkins Stafford Act 1988; *Set Asides

ABSTRACT

It is proposed that schools receiving funds under Chapter 1 (Hawkins Stafford Act 1988) be required to spend at least 20 percent of their allocations on staff development. High-quality staff development programs would enable schools to improve instruction all day for all students. Chapter 1 schools would become centers of educational renewal and professional growth and would attract teachers interested in professional growth and innovation. To avoid overloading existing staff development capacities, this requirement could be phased in over 4 years, with 5 percent set aside in Year 1, 10 percent in Year 2, 15 percent in Year 3, and 20 percent in Year 4. To complement staff development, it will be necessary to learn more about effective educational practice. The Chapter 1 Program needs a large number of programs and practices that have been well developed, well researched, and found effective. A set-aside of one percent of Chapter 1 dollars for development, evaluation, and dissemination of effective programs and practices is also recommended. Chapter 1 can thus help build the infrastructure of educational research and development (R&D). Schools should have the freedom to select consultants, programs, and trainers. (SLD)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

UD

TAC B-240

ED347247

Staff Development and R & D in Chapter 1 Programs of the Future

Robert E. Slavin

Center for Research on Effective Schooling for Disadvantaged Students
Johns Hopkins University

May, 1992

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

- ☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- ☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

This paper was written under funding from the Office of Educational Research and Evaluation, U.S. Department of Education (Grant No. OERI-R-117-R90002). However, any opinions expressed are those of the author and do not necessarily represent OERI positions or policies.

UD 028 750

Chapter 1 is changing. As a result of changes introduced in the 1988 Hawkins-Stafford Amendment and other developments in research and practice, Chapter 1 programs are increasingly focusing on improving integration of Chapter 1 and regular classroom instruction and on improvements in curriculum and instruction. Schoolwide projects have increased rapidly, and program monitoring has shifted its focus more toward learning outcomes.

Despite these positive trends, Chapter 1 still affects only a small portion of students' school days. Pullout is still the overwhelmingly most common structure for Chapter 1 services; for most Chapter 1 students, Chapter 1 means 20-40 minutes each day of remedial instruction in reading, math, or language. Except in schoolwide projects, Chapter 1 typically has little effect on instruction in the *regular* classes of Chapter 1 children. Under current regulations, Chapter 1 schools can spend up to 5% of their allocations on staff development, which can include regular teachers. Yet many schools do not even spend this much.

The reason that Chapter 1 funds have little impact on the regular program is, of course, that the regulations are designed to force schools to spend their resources on individual test-eligible children, to keep Chapter 1 from becoming general school aid. Yet it is unrealistic to expect large effects on student achievement in 20-40 minutes per day. Chapter 1 could magnify its impact substantially if a portion of Chapter 1 funds could be devoted to improving the curriculum, instructional practices, classroom management skills, assessment practices, and other skills of the regular classroom teachers with whom Chapter 1 students spend most of their day, and to enable schools to engage in school wide improvements in organization, professional development, and parent involvement.

Compared to direct service, staff development is very inexpensive. For the cost of one aide (roughly \$20,000 in salaries and benefits), an elementary school of 500 students with 20 teachers could spend \$1000 per teacher on staff development each year, enough for consultation, training, followup, materials, release time, and other services far beyond what most schools ever receive. For the cost of two aides or one teacher (\$40,000), staff development programs of exceptional quality could be implemented. It is impossible to argue that one teacher or two aides in a school of

500 students could have anything like the impact on at-risk students of a \$40,000 staff development program.

I would propose that Chapter 1 schools be required to spend at least 20% of their allocations on staff development. To avoid overloading the existing staff development capacities in each area, I would propose that this requirement be phased in over a four-year period, with a 5% required setaside in year 1, 10% in year 2, 15% in year 3, and 20% in year 4. Schools could spend more than this if they wished to do so. Schools would be permitted to bank up to one year's staff development funds to use in a future year, so that they could choose to concentrate their resources for a major staff development program in the future (and so that schools not ready for major staff development could have more time to plan).

The advantages of a 20% setaside are many. As noted earlier, high-quality staff development programs would enable schools to improve instruction all day for all their students. Further, Chapter 1 schools would become centers of educational renewal and professional growth, and would therefore attract teachers who are interested in professional growth and innovation. Since Chapter 1 funding is increasing and is likely to continue to do so, a phased-in 20% setaside would probably not force schools to reduce direct services, only to devote more of new monies to staff development. Tying a specified percentage of Chapter 1 funds to staff development is preferable to asking Congress to allocate special funds for staff development; the experience of local school districts and state departments is that whenever times get tough, staff development is the first thing to be cut. Schools (and staff development agencies) must have some confidence that staff development funds are "hardwired" into the funding stream if they are to engage in the long-term strategic planning that characterizes quality staff development.

Funding staff development is especially important now, as schools are beginning to make major shifts in curriculum and instruction to respond to the national goals and to new state assessments. Chapter 1 schools are often the last to make these changes; they should be the first.

There are two major arguments against a 20% setaside, but both can be addressed. One is that most of these funds will inevitably serve students who are not eligible for Chapter 1

services. However, as long as accountability systems continue to focus on the gains made by Chapter 1 students (or low achievers in general), it does not matter if other children benefit. To withhold effective and cost-effective services from Chapter 1 students because their classmates might also benefit would be perverse. Also, many non-Chapter 1 students in Chapter 1 schools are from poor families, and even if they are doing well enough to avoid Chapter 1 are often still not performing as well as they should.

Another argument against the setaside might be that there is no guarantee that the money would be spent on training that actually makes a difference. This is a serious concern, but could be addressed by having Chapter 1 also invest in capacity building in SEA's and LEA's and most importantly in national research and development to identify effective programs and practices. These issues are addressed below.

Research and Development in Support of Chapter 1 Staff Development

In order to achieve the high standards stated in the President's national goals, Chapter 1 schools will have to do a far better job of teaching all students. Accountability provisions and rewards and sanctions may provide incentives for schools to do a better job, but they will not work unless schools have available methods and materials to enable them to do a better job. Change depends on teachers teaching *better*, not on teachers teaching *harder*. The staff development processes discussed above would be helpful in moving Chapter 1 schools toward more effective practices, but by themselves they beg the critical question: What works? What instructional methods, curricular approaches, and materials, staff development methods, school organization plans, and other alterable features of school and classroom practice make a difference in student achievement and other outcomes? Without a set of replicable, effective instructional strategies from which Chapter 1 schools may choose, it is unlikely that responsible and effective innovation will take place.

Our current knowledge base relating to effective practice is totally inadequate. There is good research on some elements of effective practice, but it is swamped by false claims and slick

marketing. Lacking the training to critically evaluate research findings and lacking the time and resources to sift through the research in any case, most educators give up on trying to figure out what really works and instead rely on what's "in." The result is rampant faddism, with educators rushing from one untested miracle to another.

The federal involvement in R & D on effective programs has been minimal. Chapter 1/Title I has spent millions on evaluation but \$0.00 to support development, assessment, and diffusion of programs and practices designed to enhance student achievement. OERI primarily funds academic research, not program development. One indication of this is that although almost all OERI money goes to labs and centers, the National Diffusion Network list of effective programs contains only a handful of programs (out of more than 500) developed by labs or centers. The NDN is supposed to certify and then help disseminate effective programs, but its evaluation requirements are minimal and its funding to help disseminate its programs has been tiny.

What Chapter 1 needs is a large number of programs and practices that have been well developed, well researched, and found to be effective, and are then readily available to Chapter 1 schools. Work to this end must proceed on several fronts. I would propose a setaside of one percent of Chapter 1 dollars to be used for development, evaluation, and dissemination of effective programs and practices for use in Chapter 1 schools*. First, Chapter 1 should fund research on effective practices, including development and evaluation of specific programs and materials, staff development and school organization methods, and so on. The products of this R & D process would be both particular programs (e.g., reading programs like Reading Recovery, school organization plans like Levin's or Comer's models), as well as variables relating to effective practice (e.g., information on how to integrate classroom and supportive services, how to organize peer coaching to support adoption of an innovation, how to use discovery in mathematics or Reciprocal Teaching in reading).

* This is one percent over and above the funds now used (primarily by Policy and Evaluation Services) to assess the overall effectiveness and nature of Chapter 1 programs. The setaside is for research on programs and practices for use in Chapter 1 programs, not general program evaluation.

Second, Chapter 1 should fund third-party evaluations of promising programs and practices. This is perhaps the most important element of the overall R & D plan, as it is totally lacking today. Third-party evaluations would negotiate measures, designs, and procedures with developers and researchers, and would then conduct top-quality evaluations, comparing the achievement of students who experienced a given program or practice to similar students in run-of-the-mill Chapter 1 models. Developers would know the objectives to be assessed but not the items. Programs and practices chosen to be evaluated would be ones whose developers had already done their own successful evaluations. Prime candidates would include, by the way, the new "break-the-mold" programs soon to be developed in the America 2000 New American Schools plan. The outcome of these third-party evaluations would be a set of programs and practices capable of significantly enhancing student achievement (if properly implemented). Most importantly, adopters could have faith in the evaluations and, therefore, in the programs. This would help them feel better able to invest in high-quality staff development, followup, and maintenance needed to implement the programs and continue them over time. The third-party evaluations would give education something like the FDA, which is essential in giving physicians and patients confidence in medications and medical procedures. Until we have third-party evaluations we can trust, we have fads. It's as simple as that.

Certifying better mousetraps in no way guarantees their use. Developers and researchers will need funding to take their ideas from the pilot stage to disseminable form. This means funding for video tapes, awareness and training manuals, building of regional training sites, establishment of "lighthouse" model schools for use in a comprehensive training plan, and so on.

The next requirement is a system to make Chapter 1 schools aware of the range of proven and promising programs that they might consider. The NDN awareness conferences provide a model for this, but as Chapter 1 takes on a more active role in staff development state and local agencies may need to take on similar functions.

Chapter 1 should help support the building of the R & D infrastructure, since no one else seems interested in doing so. By this I mean that it should fund predoctoral and postdoctoral

fellowships for talented young researchers to get into R & D relating to the needs of Chapter 1 schools. The need to attract the best minority students into this area of research is especially great. At present, very few talented students choose educational research as a profession, and fewer still choose applied research in schools serving disadvantaged students. This must change if R & D is to become a key focus of Chapter 1.

Finally, it is essential that the word gets out about effective programs and practices for Chapter 1 schools. Part of the overall R & D plan should be commissioning of summaries of research on effective practices, reports on important findings, and so on. The Department of Education might fund a research journal and a practitioner oriented newsletter to communicate new developments in Chapter 1. Reports may also be written for parents and community members.

The net effect of the R & D plan I'm proposing would be revolutionary, but essential. If Chapter 1 is to demand the use of the best practices with Chapter 1 students, someone must know what best practices are. Given the history of R & D, there is little chance that this information will be forthcoming from anywhere else. For one percent of Chapter 1 funds, Chapter 1 can build toward a time when school staffs will be able to choose from among an array of programs known to be capable of achieving the high levels of performance we all have agreed to be necessary, it can help move educational innovation from faddism to science, and it can help build the infrastructure of educational R & D.

School Control Over Staff Development Resources

Schools (not districts) are the organizations held responsible for student gains in the current Chapter 1 accountability system, and this responsibility is likely to remain in the future. Consequently, schools should largely control their staff development dollars. Ideally, school staffs should be able to choose from among effective programs, select trainers and materials, and so on. They should be encouraged to pool funds with other schools to, for example, bring in a trainer or workshop program that would be appropriate for multiple schools. In practice, it is likely that the LEA would take a major role in determining how schools spend their staff

development resources, since the district does have ultimate authority over its schools. However, Chapter 1 practices should strengthen the role of the individual school in deciding on its own needs.

State departments, LEA's, intermediate units, universities, and other organizations will all be expected to develop capacity to support innovation in Chapter 1 schools, but the schools should have the freedom to make its own selections of consultants, programs, and trainers. By creating a "free market" of professional development services, schools will avoid being saddled with ineffective or inappropriate services; good programs will grow, poor ones will fade, regardless of who sponsors them. Chapter 1 should help build staff development capacity in each state and region, but not compel schools to use any particular service.

Building Capacity to Support Innovation

Serious, long-term staff development is so rare in American education that existing capacity for supporting it is inadequate. At current levels, a 20% setaside would mean \$1.34 billion, far more than the current structure could absorb (adding together all funding now going to labs, TAC's, the NDN, and all SEA staff development probably comes to less than 10% of this figure). Therefore, I would propose that Chapter 1 provide funds to SEA's to help them build capacity within their states to support innovation. This could mean establishing state or regional Chapter 1 Improvement Centers; working out ways to identify and certify school change experts who would work with schools to help them decide what changes they should be making and make them aware of training or materials to support innovation; contracting with universities or innovative LEA's to help with school change; or supplementing existing National Diffusion Network program. However, as noted earlier, the fact that SEA's build capacity to support innovation in no way implies that schools must use their services.